



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

דָּילְכֶּי יְהֹלֵכְךָ would seem preferable to יְתַהֲלֵכְךָ. The meaning of the couplet is, "For light" (*i. e.*, in place of the light of the sun and moon which had retired during the storm), "thine arrows were going abroad; for brightness, the lightning of thy spear."

Verse 15 of Habakkuk cannot be corrected by the corresponding verse 20 of the psalm. In the latter the word אלְהִים has probably dropped out at the end of the first member, where it was used for padding out the passage by the somewhat mechanical versifier, just as in vs. 17. With this correction the parallelism is too good to be disturbed by accommodating it to the Habakkuk form. The noun דָּרְכֶּךָ is required by בַּיִם דָּרְכֶּךָ אֱלֹהִים and שְׁבִילִיךְ; and yet עֲקָבוֹתֶיךָ; two words being nearly the same in both, while the parallel members have מֵים רַבִּים in common. Instead of the noun חָנֻכָּה or חָנֻכָּה a verb form is required, חָנַכוּ or חָנַכוּ.

WILLIAM HAYES WARD.

NEW YORK CITY.

SUGGESTIONS CONCERNING THE ORIGINAL TEXT AND STRUCTURE OF AMOS 1:3—2:5.

ONE always approaches with hesitation the work of correcting the Old Testament text. But if we rightly consider the matter, we shall see that the hesitation is ungrounded. The evidence is overwhelming that the present text has suffered countless changes at the hands of careless scribes and interested editors. I am, at present, particularly interested in the help for the reconstruction of the text which is furnished by the strophic structure, and it is from this point of view that the following suggestions are offered. The problem is a most interesting one, and if the main proposition is true, the field opened is a wide one. I am not unmindful of what has already been done in this direction by students of Hebrew poetry.

The passage proposed for consideration is a unit, whether we regard it from the point of view of author or editor. Nowhere may we find better evidence of poetic skill than in the writings of Amos, whose work falls in the earliest period of written prophecy. An examination of these sections, seven in all, reveals clear indications, at the same time, of the artistic character of the original structure and of the violation of the same. For the sake of convenience of treatment, a convenience which grows out of the structure itself, I desire to present the sections in three groups, viz., (1) the sections concerning Damascus and

Gaza, 1:3—5 and 6—8; (2) the sections concerning Ammon and Moab, 1:13—15 and 2:1—3; (3) the sections concerning Tyre, Edom, and Judah, 1:9, 10; 1:11, 12; 2:4, 5. I shall restrict myself to a presentation of the text as restored and in the case of each group to a few remarks upon the more important changes.

Judgments upon Syria and Philistia.

1:3—5.

- (1) כה אמר יְהוָה
עַל־שְׁלֹשָׁה פְשָׁעִים דְמִשְׁקָן
וּעַל־אֶרְבָּעָה לֹא אֲשִׁירָנוּ
עַל דּוֹתָם בְּחִרְצֹות הַבָּרוֹזֵל
אַתְּהַגֵּל עַד
- (2) וְשַׁלְחָתִי אֶשׁ בְּבַיִת חֹזֶל
וְאֶכֶּלֶת אַרְמָנוֹת בְּקִידָּד
וְשִׁבְרוֹתִי בְּרִיחַ דְמִשְׁקָן
- (3) וְהַכְּרָתִי יוֹשֵׁב מִבְּקַעַת־אָרֶן
וְתוֹמֶךְ שְׁבֵט מִבֵּית־עָדָן
וְגַלְיוֹ עַמִּים־אָרָם קֹרֶה
[אמֶר יְהוָה]

1:6—8.

- (1) כה אמר יְהוָה
עַל־שְׁלֹשָׁה פְשָׁעִים עָזָה
וּעַל־אֶרְבָּעָה לֹא אֲשִׁירָנוּ
עַל־הַגְּלוּתָם גָּלוֹת טְלִמָּה
לְהַכְּנִיר לְאַרְוֹם
- (2) וְשַׁלְחָתִי אֶשׁ בְּחוֹמָת עָזָה
וְאֶכֶּלֶת אַרְמָנוֹת יְהִי
וְהַשִּׁיבָותִי יְהִי עַל־עֲקָרוֹן
- (3) וְהַכְּרָתִי יוֹשֵׁב מַאֲשָׁדוֹד
וְתוֹמֶךְ שְׁבֵט מַאֲשָׁקְלוֹן
וְאֶבֶדֶר שָׂארִית פְּלֶשְׁתִּים
[אמֶר אֱלֹהִי יְהוָה]

The changes proposed are the following :

(1) In 1:3—5 : (a) To connect רְשִׁבְרוֹתִי וְגַלְיוֹ (v. 5) with str. 2, instead of with str. 3, as indicated by M. T. This line completes the thought of str. 2, forming its culmination, and is really shut out of str. 3, both on account of the syntax which binds closely together lines 1 and 2 of str. 3, and by the rising thought of the str., which is suggested in the climax, “inhabitant” (*i. e.*, common people) (l. 1), “ruler” (l. 2), “whole people” (l. 3). (b) To omit “**אמֶר יְ**” (v. 5) as superfluous.

(2) In 1:6—8 : (a) To transpose וְדִשְׁבוֹתִי יְהִי עַל־עֲקָרוֹן (v. 8^b) to follow the last line of v. 7 (see above). This brings the lines beginning with וְהַכְּרָתִי into the same position in this section as in the corresponding section ; the lines beginning with וְתוֹמֶךְ are also brought together, and, still further, there is thus secured a climactic arrangement for str. 3. (b) To omit here as before the superfluous אֱלֹהִי אֱלֹהִי יְהוָה.

With these slight changes, the two sections exhibit the most striking parallelism in structure. This is seen in both sections, (1) in the trimeter movement which prevails throughout; (2) in the strophic division, 5+3+3; (3) in the first line of str. 1; (4) in the use of **על** at the beginning of lines 2, 3, 4 of str. 1, with a change in l. 5; (5) in the short line (dimeter) closing str. 1; (6) in the verbal forms beginning lines 1, 2, and 3 of str. 2; (7) in the similar language used throughout strophes 2 and 3.

It is impossible to suppose that the poet was not striving for this similarity. The changes suggested make the parallelism as strict as it could well be made with a different subject for each strophe.

Judgments upon Ammon and Moab.

1:13-15.

- (1) כה אמר ידוה
על-טלשה פשעי בני-עמוֹן
על- ארבעה לא אשייבנו
על-בקעם הזרות הגלעד
למִן הרוחיב אתח-גבים
- (2) והצתי את בחומת רבה
ואכלת ארמנותה הקרויה
בתרועה ביום מלחתה
- (3) והלך מלכם בנוליה
הוא ושריו ייחדו
אמר ידוה

2:1-3.

- (1) כה אמר ידוה
על-טלשה פשעי מואב
על- ארבעה לא אשייבנו
על-טרפו עצמות מלך-אדום
לטוד חמתה בשארון מואב
- (2) וטלחותי את במלאב
ואכלת ארמנותה הקרויה
בתרועה בקיל שופר
- (3) והכרתי טופט מקרבה
וכל טריד אחזוג עמו
אמר ידוה

The changes proposed are the following:

(1) In 1:13-15: (a) To treat as a gloss **סופה** (v. 14) because it is only a weak repetition of the preceding clause, and has nothing to correspond to it in the parallel section on Moab, the parallelism between the two sections being otherwise perfect.

(2) In 2:1-3: (a) To restore **לטוד** (2:2) to **לטוד** (*cf.* for a similar use of the objective genitive Ps. 12:6, and note the use of this word in Amos 3:10, 5:9 (*bis*), and (b) to join with it **חמתה וגו'** (for **וְמֵתָה**) (*for the violation of (=thus violating) the dead, in return for desolation to Moab;*^x this makes the number of lines in both

^xI confess that this is not satisfactory; but it is no worse than the text, or the many emendations which have been suggested, and which I cannot here take up.

to בחרועה and וأكلת, stand together, provides a parallel line for the purpose-clause למן וננו', and removes the inexplicable לשיד from a line to which it cannot belong.

Judgments upon Tyre, Edom, and Judah.

Line 3 of str. 3 may or may not be retained.

I. 9, 10.	I. 11, 12.
כה אמר יהוה על-שלשה פשעי צר ועל-ארבעה לא אטיבנו על-חסנירם גלוות שלמה לאדום ולא צלרו בריה אחיהם ושלחתי אש בחומת צר ואכלת ארמנותה	כה אמר יהוה על-שלשה פשעי אדום ועל-ארבעה לא אטיבנו על-ירדפו בחורב אחיו ויתר לעד אףו ושלחתי אש בחומן ואכלת ארמנות בצרה
	2:4, 5.
	כה אמר יהודה על-שלשה פשעי יהודה ועל ארבעה לא אטיבנו על מאשם את-תורת יהודה וחקיו לא שמרו ושלחתי אש ביהודה ואכלת ארמנות ירושלם

As thus constructed, the three sections stand together and differ radically from the four which have already been presented. In each of these cases str. 1, like str. 1 of the four preceding sections, includes (1) the divine authority (line 1), (2) the use of the symbolical numbers marking the transgression in a general way as one often repeated (ll. 2, 3), (3) the more specific change (ll. 4, 5). Str. 2, in each of these cases (1) has two lines instead of three, (2) predicts destruction by fire which shall devour the palaces, (3) corresponds literally to lines 1, 2 of str. 2 of the four preceding sections (except that the first section uses רשלחותי ו怛צתי for ו怛צתי). There is nothing here to correspond to line 3 of str. 2, or to str. 3 of the preceding pieces. The explanation of this striking variation of form will be discussed later. The changes which have been made are as follows:

(1) In 1:9, 10, none; this being the original type of the shorter section.

(2) In 1:11, 12; (a) the omission of the gloss **ושחת רחמיין**; (b) the omission of the gloss **יעברחו שמרה נצח** (these phrases bear upon their face the character of the gloss); (c) the restoration of **ויתרך** to **ויתרך ויתרך**.²

רוחעים כובדים (3) In 2:4, 5; (a) the omission of the gloss **אשר הלבכו אבותם אחריהם**, which is comparatively late in the thought expressed (*cf.* Ex. 32:1, Dt. 9:12), very awkward in its syntactical connection with the preceding, and plainly the interpretation of what precedes by a later writer.

We have now four pieces of very similar form on Syria, Philistia, Ammon and Moab; and three pieces of similar form, distinct from the four, on Tyre, Edom, and Judah. Is there any evidence that the last three are interpolations?

The Edom sections: (1) The names Teman and Bozrah occur elsewhere only in late writings (so Wellhausen). (2) Edom, in early times, was subject to Judah, and suffered more from Judah than Judah from Edom. How could a prophet from Judah reproach Edom for cruelty? The cruelty which furnished the basis for ill-feeling on the part of Israel, came with the exile when Edom "behaved shamefully towards Israel." It was not unnatural, therefore, that a later writer, devoid of historical perspective, and thinking that Edom deserved denunciation, should frame a section which in due time secured a place in the text of Amos.³

*The Judah section:*⁴ (1) The introduction of this section removes entirely the force of surprise which the Israelites would otherwise have felt; (2) it seems impossible to suppose that Amos would have treated Judah so cursorily and in a manner so like that with which he treated the outside nations; (3) the times of Judah's sin are of a Deuteronomic character and of a later origin (*cf.* **חקר לא שמור**, Dt. 4:6, 6:24, 16:12, 17:19) with the frequently recurring phrases *to observe to do, to observe and do*; (4) the transgression of "instruction" and "statutes" was too indefinite and not so flagrant as to call for its introduction in this place; (5) there is a "certain tameness and vagueness of state-

² See OLSHAUSEN, on Ps. 103:9.

³ See recent commentaries, especially GUNNING, WELLHAUSEN, GEORGE ADAM SMITH, *in loc.*

⁴ GEORGE ADAM SMITH, Vol. I, p. 135.

ment, which contrasts remarkably with the usual pungency of the prophet's style."

The Tyre section.: This is mentioned last because it is least clear. Suspicion has attached itself to (1) the fact that Tyre alone is mentioned, the other cities being passed over (*cf.* on the other hand, Gaza, Ekron and Ashkelon in the case of Philistia); (2) the similarity of thought and language in the judgment upon Gaza; (3) the absence of the usual formula; (4) the similarity in form to that of Edom and Judah. The answer of George Adam Smith⁵ is not satisfactory.

If these considerations are valid, we find that one strophic construction prevails in the original material and quite a different one in the later addition. Here *form* confirms the suspicions which had already been aroused as to the authenticity.

In conclusion : (1) Whether the seven sections or only four of the seven are treated as authentic, the evident purpose of the author (or authors) is to put the material in poetic form, and in the treatment of each section to use essentially the same form, and, so far as possible, the same words. (2) This being true, we are warranted in supposing that radical variations, for which no other explanation may be offered, and in which the entire symmetry of the piece is destroyed, are the result of textual corruption, or editorial change. (3) If in the piece as a whole, two entirely different strophic types appear, we must suppose that this is due either (*a*) to the desire of the author for mere variety, or (*b*) to a distinct purpose in connection with the thought of the piece, or (*c*) to the fact that it is the work of a different author. The last explanation would have force only if strengthened by other considerations.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

WILLIAM R. HARPER.

PETER'S SOJOURN IN ROME.

IT is not my intention in this brief note to discuss the fact of Peter's presence in Rome. That he found his way thither in the latter part of his life, and met his death there, is now so generally recognized among scholars that it would be gratuitous to argue the matter. But though the fact itself may be regarded as established, the date of the apostle's arrival in Rome and the length of his stay there demand, it seems to me, renewed investigation.

The prevalent opinion is that he did not reach Rome until after the close of Paul's two years' imprisonment, which is commonly put

⁵ *The Twelve Prophets*, Vol. I, p. 128.